arXiv:1010.2306v1 [math.OC] 12 Oct 2010

Non-zero Sum Stochastic Differential Games of Fully Coupled Forward-Backward Stochastic Systems

Maoning Tang[1] Qingxin Meng[1] Yongzheng Sun[2]

Abstract

In this paper, an open-loop two-person non-zero sum stochastic differential game is considered for forward-backward stochastic systems. More precisely, the controlled systems are described by a fully coupled nonlinear multi- dimensional forward-backward stochastic differential equation driven by a multi-dimensional Brownian motion. one sufficient (a verification theorem) and one necessary conditions for the existence of open-loop Nash equilibrium points for the corresponding two-person non-zero sum stochastic differential game are proved. The control domain need to be convex and the admissible controls for both players are allowed to appear in both the drift and diffusion of the state equations.

Keywords: N-person differential games, forward-backward stochastic differential equation, Nash equilibrium point.

1 Introduction

Differential Game theory had been an active area of research and a useful tool in many applications, particularly in biology and economic. The so called differential games are the ones in which the position, being controlled by the players, evolves continuously. On the one hand, since the study of differential games was initiated by Isaacs [18], many papers (see [4, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15]) have appeared which developed the foundations for two-person zero sum differential games. For this case, there a single performance criterion which one player tries to minimize and the other tries to maximize. On the other hand, many authors (see [16, 8, 9, 11, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 26, 30]discussed N-person non-zero sum differential games. For this case, there may be more than two players and each player tries to minimize his individual performance criterion, and the sum of all player's criteria is not zero or is it constant.

All the above mentioned paper are restricted deterministic system. On the differential games of stochastic systems, we can refer to[2, 17, 29]. In 2008, Tang and Li [28] established the minimax principle for N-person differential games governed by forward stochastic systems with the control appearing in the diffusion term. In 2010, wang and Yu [31] studied the Non-zero sum differential games of backward stochastic systems, and they established a necessary condition and a sufficient condition in the form of stochastic maximum principle for open-loop Nash equilibrium.

---

[1] Department of Mathematics, Huzhou University, Huzhou, 313000,China, Email: 071018034@fudan.edu.cn.

[2] School of Sciences, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou, 221008, China, Email: yzsung@gmail.com

Forward-Backward stochastic systems are not only used in mathematical economics (see Antonelli [1], Duffie and Epstein [10], for example), but also used in mathematical finance(see El Karoui, Peng and Quenez [12]). It now becomes more clear that certain important problems in mathematical economics and mathematical finance, especially in the optimization problem, can be formulated to be Forward-backward stochastic system. So the optimal control problem for Forward-backward stochastic system and the corresponding stochastic maximum principle are extensively studied in this literature. We refer to [33, 32, 24] and references therein. They established the necessary maximum principle in the case the control domain is convex or the forward diffusion coefficients can not contain a control variable. In 2010, Yong[34] proved necessary conditions for the optimal control of forward-backward stochastic systems where the control domain is not assumed to be convex and the control appears in the diffusion coefficient of the forward equation.

In this paper we will discuss non-zero sum stochastic differential games for forward-backward stochastic systems. To our best knowledge, very little work has been published on this subject. In section 2, we state the problem and our main assumptions. In section 3, we state and prove our main results: a sufficient condition for the existence of open-loop Nash equilibrium point which can check whether the candidate equilibrium points are optimal or not. Section 4 is devoted to present a necessary condition for the existence of open-loop Nash equilibrium point by the stochastic maximum principle for the optimal control of the optimal control problem of forward-backward stochastic systems established in [32].

Moreover, we refer to [21, 20] on the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the fully coupled forward-backward stochastic differential equations.

2 Problem formulation and main assumptions

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, P)$ be a complete probability space, on which a d-dimensional standard Brownian motion $B(\cdot)$ is defined with $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ being its natural filtration, augmented by all P-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$. Let $T > 0$ be a fixed time horizon. Let E be a Euclidean space. The inner product in E is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, and the norm in E is denoted by $|\cdot|$. We further introduce some other spaces that will be used in the paper. Denote by $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P; E)$ the the set of all E-valued $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable η such that $E|\eta|^2 < \infty$. Denote by $M^2(0, T; E)$ the set of all E-valued $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted stochastic processes $\{\varphi(t) : t \in [0, T]\}$ which satisfy $E\int_0^T |\varphi(t)|^2 dt < \infty$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}^2(0, T; E)$ the set of all E-valued $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted continuous stochastic processes $\{\varphi(t) : t \in [0, T]\}$ which satisfy $E \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\varphi(t)|^2 dt < \infty$.

In this paper, we consider the system which is given by a controlled fully coupled nonlinear forward-backward stochastic differential equations (abbr. FBSDEs) of the form

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} dx(t) & = & b(t, x(t), y(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t))dt \\ & & +\sigma(t, x(t), y(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t))dB(t), \\ dy(t) & = & -f(t, x(t), y(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t))dt \\ & & +z(t)dB(t), \\ x(0) & = & a, \\ y(T) & = & \xi. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.1}$$

Here $b : [0, T] \times R^n \times R^m \times R^{m\times d} \times U_1 \times U_2 \to R^n, \sigma : [0, T] \times R^n \times R^m \times R^{m\times d} \times U_1 \times U_2 \to R^{n\times d}, f : [0, T] \times R^n \times R^m \times R^{m\times d} \times U_1 \times U_2 \to R^m$ are given mapping, a and $T > 0$ are given constants, and$\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P; R^m)$. The processes $u_1(\cdot)$ and $u_2(\cdot)$ in the system (2.1) are the open-loop control processes which present the controls of the two players, required to have values in two given nonempty convex sets $U_1 \subset R^{k_1}$ and $U_2 \subset R^{k_2}$ respectively. The admissible control process $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ is defined as a $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted process with values in $U_1 \times U_2$ such that $E\int_0^T (|u_1(t)|^2 + |u_2(t)|^2)dt < +\infty$. The set of all admissible control processes is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$.

For each one of the two player, there is a cost functional

$$\begin{aligned} & J_i(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \\ = \ & E\bigg[\int_0^T l_i(t, x(t), y(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t))dt \\ & +\phi_i(x(T)) + h_i(y(0))\bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $l_i : [0,T] \times R^n \times R^m \times R^{m\times d} \times \mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_2 \to R, \phi_i : R^n \to R, h_i : R^m \to R$ are given mapping $(i = 1, 2)$.

Now we make the main assumptions throughout the paper.

Assumption 2.1. f, g, σ are continuously differentiable with respect to (x, y, z, u_1, u_2). The derivatives of f, g, σ are bounded. For any admissible control $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$, the forward-backward stochastic system satisfies the assumptions (H2.1) and (H2.2) in Wu[32].

Assumption 2.2. l_i, ϕ_i and h_i are continuously differentiable with respect to $(x, y, z, u_1, u_2), x$ and $y, (i = 1, 2)$. And l_i is bounded by $C(1+|x|^2+|y|^2+|z|^2+|u_1|^2+|u_2|^2)$. And the derivatives of l_i are bounded by $C(1+|x|+|y|+|z|+|u_1|+|u_2|)$. And ϕ_i and h_i are bounded by $C(1+|x|^2)$ and $C(1 + |y|^2)$ respectively. And the derivatives of ϕ_i and h_i with respect to x and y are bounded by $C(1 + |x|)$ and $C(1 + |y|)$ respectively. $(i = 1, 2)$.

Under Assumption 2.1, from Theorem 2.1 in Wu [32], we see that for any given admissible control $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)$, the system (2.1) admits a unique solution

$$(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot)) \in S^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; R^n)\times \in S^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; R^m)\times \in M^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; R^{m\times d}).$$

Then we call $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ the state process corresponding to the control process $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)$ and $((u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ the admissible pair. Furthermore, from Assumption 2.2, it is easy to check that$|J_i(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))| < \infty.(i = 1, 2)$.

Then we can pose the following two-person non-zero sum stochastic differential game problem

Problem 2.1. *Find an open-loop admissible control* $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ *such that*

$$J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J_1(u_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)). \tag{2.4}$$

Any $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ satisfying the above is called a open-loop Nash equilibrium point of Problem 2.1. Such an admissible control allows two players to play individual optimal control strategies simultaneously.

3 A Verification Theorem

In this section we state and prove a verification theorem for the Nash equilibrium points of Problem 2.1.

For any given admissible pair $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$, We can introduce the following adjoint forward-backward stochastic differential equations of the system (2.1)

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rl} dk^i(t) = & -\Big[b_y^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))p^i(t) \\ & +\sigma_y^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))q^i(t) \\ & -f_y^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))k^i(t) \\ & +l_{iy}(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))\Big]dt \\ & -\Big[b_z^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))p^i(t) \\ & +\sigma_z^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))q^i(t) \\ & -f_z^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))k^i(t) \\ & +l_{iz}(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))\Big]dB(t) \\ dp^i(t) = & -\Big[b_x^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))p^i(t) \\ & +\sigma_x^*(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))q^i(t) \\ & -f_x(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))k^i(t) \\ & +l_{ix}(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t))\Big]dt \\ & +q^i(t)dB(t) \\ k^i(0) = & -h_{iy}(y_0), \quad p^i(T) = \phi_{ix}(x(T)), \\ & \ 0 \le t \le T, (i = 1.2). \end{array}\right. \tag{3.1}$$

Under Assumptions2.1-2.2, according to Theorem 2.2 in [32], the above adjoint equation has a unique solution $(k^i(\cdot), p^i(\cdot), q^i(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;R^m)\times \in \mathcal{S}^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;R^n)\times \in M_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;R^{n\times d}), (i = 1.2)$.

We define the Hamiltonian functions $H_i : [0,T]\times R^n \times R^m \times R^{m\times d} \times \mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_2 \times R^n \times R^{n\times d} \times R^m \to R$ by

$$\begin{array}{l} H_i(t,x,y,z,u_1,u_2,p,q,k) = \langle k, -f(t,x,y,z,u_1,u_2\rangle \\ +\langle p, b(t,x,y,z,u_1,u_2)\rangle + l_i(t,x,y,z,u_1,u_2) \\ +\langle q, \sigma(t,x,y,z,u_1,u_2)\rangle, (i = 1,2). \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

Then we can rewrite the equations (3.1) in Hamiltonian system's form:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} dk^i(t) & = -H_{iy}(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t),p^i(t),q^i(t),k^i(t))dt \\ & \quad -H_{iz}(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t),p^i(t),q^i(t),k^i(t))dB(t) \\ dp^i(t) & = -H_{ix}(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),u_2(t),p^i(t),q^i(t),k^i(t))dt \\ & \quad +q^i(t)dB(t) \\ k^i(0) = & -h_{iy}(y_0), \quad p^i(T) = \phi_{ix}(x(T)), (i = 1,2). \end{array}\right. \tag{3.3}$$

We are now coming to a verification theorem for an Nash equilibrium point of Problem 2.1.

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.2, let* $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot);\bar{x}(\cdot),\bar{y}(\cdot),\bar{z}(\cdot))$ *be an admissible pair. Let* $(\bar{p^i}(\cdot),\bar{q^i}(\cdot),\bar{k}^i(\cdot))(i=1,2)$ *be the unique solution of the corresponding adjoint equation* (3.1). *Suppose that for almost all* $(t,\omega)\in[0,T]\times\Omega$, $(x,y,z,u_1)\mapsto H_1(t,x,y,z,u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))$ *is convex with respect to* (x,y,z,u_1), $(x,y,z,u_2)\mapsto H_2(t,x,y,z,\bar{u}_1(t),u_2,\bar{p}^2(t),\bar{q}^2(t),\bar{k}^2(t))$ *is convex with respect to* (x,y,z,u_2), $x\mapsto h_i(x)$ *is convex with respect with to* x, *and* $y\mapsto\phi_i(y)$ *is convex with respect to* y *(i=1,2), and the following optimality condition holds*

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{u_1\in\mathcal{U}_1}H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))\\&\qquad=H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)),\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{u_2\in\mathcal{U}_2}H_2(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2,\bar{p}^2(t),\bar{q}^2(t),\bar{k}^2(t))\\&\qquad=H_2(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^2(t),\bar{q}^2(t),\bar{k}^2(t)).\end{aligned}\tag{3.5}$$

Then $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ *is Nash equilibrium point of Problem 2.1*

Proof. (i) we consider an stochastic optimal control problem. The system is the following controlled forward-backward stochastic differential equation

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl}dx(t)&=&b(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))dt\\&&+\sigma(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))dB(t),\\dy(t)&=&-f(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))dt\\&&+z(t)dB(t),\\x(0)&=&a\\y(T)&=&\xi,\end{array}\right.\tag{3.6}$$

where $u_1(\cdot)$ is any given admissible control in $\mathcal{A}_1$. The cost function is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}&J_1(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))\\=\;&E\bigg[\int_0^T l_1(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))dt\\&+\phi_1(x(T))+h_1(y_0)\bigg],\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

where $(x(\cdot),y(\cdot),z(\cdot))$ is the solution to the forward-backward stochastic system (3.6) corresponding to the control $u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1$.

The optimal control problem is minimize $J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ over $u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1$. Now will show the admissible control $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)$ is an optimal control of the problem, i.e,

$$J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))=\min_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1}J_1(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)).\tag{3.8}$$

In fact, Let $u_1(\cdot)$ be any admissible control in $\mathcal{A}_1$, $(x(\cdot),y(\cdot),z(\cdot))$ be the corresponding state process of the system (3.6). It is easy to check that for the control $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)$, the corresponding state process of the system (3.6) is indeed $(\bar{x}(\cdot),\bar{y}(\cdot),\bar{z}(\cdot))$.

From (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&J_1(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) - J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))\\
&\quad = E\int_0^T \Big[l_1(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\\
&\qquad - l_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\Big]dt\\
&\qquad + E\Big[\phi_1(x(T)) - \phi_1(\bar{x}(T))\Big]\\
&\qquad + E\Big[h_1(y(0)) - h_1(\bar{y}(0))\Big]\\
&\quad = I_1 + I_2,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 = E\int_0^T &\Big[l_1(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\\
&- l_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\Big]dt,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

$$I_2 = E\Big[\phi_1(x(T)) - \phi_1(\bar{x}(t))\Big] + E\Big[h_1(y(0)) - h_1(\bar{y}(0))\Big].\tag{3.11}$$

Using Convexity of ϕ_1 and h_1, and Itô formula to $\langle \bar{p}^1(t), x(t)-\bar{x}(t)\rangle + \langle \bar{k}^1(t), y(t)-\bar{y}(t)\rangle$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 \quad &= E\big[\phi_1(x(T)) - \phi_1(\bar{x}(T))\big] + E\big[h_1(y(0) - h_1(\bar{y}(0))\big]\\
&\geq E\langle \phi_{1x}(\bar{x}(T)), x(T)-\bar{x}(T)\rangle + E\langle h_{1y}(\bar{y}_0), y_0-\bar{y}_0\rangle\\
&= E\langle \bar{p}^1(T)), x(T)-\bar{x}(T)\rangle + E\langle \bar{k}^1(0), y_0-\bar{y}_0\rangle\\
&= -E\int_0^T \langle H_{1x}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), x(t)-\bar{x}(t)\rangle dt\\
&\quad - E\int_0^T \langle H_{1y}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), y(t)-\bar{y}(t)\rangle dt\\
&\quad - E\int_0^T \langle H_{1z}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), z(t)-\bar{z}(t)\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle \bar{p}^1(t), b(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - b(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle \bar{q}^1(t), \sigma(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - \sigma(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle \bar{k}^1(t), -(f(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - f(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)))\rangle dt\\
&= -J_1 + J_2,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 \quad &= E\int_0^T \langle H_{1x}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), x(t)-\bar{x}(t)\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle H_{1y}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), y(t)-\bar{y}(t)\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle H_{1z}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), z(t)-\bar{z}(t)\rangle dt,\\
J_2 = \quad & E\int_0^T \langle \bar{p}^1(t), b(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - b(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle \bar{q}^1(t), \sigma(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - \sigma(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\rangle dt\\
&\quad + E\int_0^T \langle \bar{k}^1(t), -(f(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - f(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)))\rangle dt
\end{aligned}$$

and we have used the fact that

$$y(T)-\bar{y}(T) = \xi - \xi = 0, x(0)-\bar{x}(0) = a - a = 0.$$

On the other hand, in view of the definition of Hamilton function H_1 (see (3.2)), the integration I_1 can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 = \quad & E\int_0^T \Big[l_1(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\\
&\qquad - l_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\Big] dt\\
= \quad & E\int_0^T \Big[H_1(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))\\
& -H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))\Big] dt\\
& -E\int_0^T \langle \bar{p}^1(t), b(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - b(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\rangle dt\\
& -E\int_0^T \langle \bar{q}^1(t), \sigma(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - \sigma(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))\rangle dt\\
& -E\int_0^T \langle \bar{k}^1(t), -(f(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)) - f(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)))\rangle dt\\
= \quad & J_3 - J_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 =& E\int_0^T \Big[H_1(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))\\
& - H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))\Big] dt
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

From the optimality condition (3.4), we have

$$\Big\langle H_{1u_1}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), u_1(t)-\bar{u}_1(t)\Big\rangle \geq 0, a.s.a.e.. \tag{3.15}$$

Using convexity of $H_1(t,x,y,z,u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t))$ with respect to (x,y,z,u_1), and noting (3.14) and (3.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &\geq E\int_0^T \langle H_{1x}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), x(t)-\bar{x}(t)\rangle dt \\ &\quad + E\int_0^T \langle H_{1y}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), y(t)-\bar{y}(t)\rangle dt \\ &\quad + E\int_0^T \langle H_{1z}(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}^1(t),\bar{q}^1(t),\bar{k}^1(t)), z(t)-\bar{z}(t)\rangle dt \\ &= J_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore, it follows from (3.9), (3.12),(3.13) and (3.16) that

$$\begin{aligned} J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) &= I_1 + I_2 = (J_3 - J_2) + I_2 \\ &\geq (J_1 - J_2) + (-J_1 + J_2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1$ is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \min_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J_1(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)). \tag{3.17}$$

(ii) Now we consider another stochastic optimal control problem. The system is the following controlled forward-backward stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) &= b(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2(t))dt \\ &\quad +\sigma(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2(t))dB(t) \\ dy(t) &= -f(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2(t))dt \\ &\quad +z(t)dB(t) \\ x(0) &= a \\ y(T) &= \xi, \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

where $u_2(\cdot)$ is any given admissible control in $\mathcal{A}_2$. The cost function is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} &J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)) \\ = \;& E\bigg[\int_0^T l_2(t,x(t),y(t),z(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2(t))dt \\ &+\phi_2(x(T)) + h_2(y_0)\bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $(x(\cdot),y(\cdot),z(\cdot))$ is the solution to the system (3.18) corresponding to the control $u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2$.

The optimal control problem is minimize $J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))$ over $u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2$. As in (i), we can similarly show the admissible control $\bar{u}_2(\cdot)$ is an optimal control of the problem, i.e,

$$J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \min_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)). \tag{3.20}$$

So from (3.17) and (3.20), we can conclude that $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an equilibrium point of Problem 2.1. The proof is complete.

□

4 Necessary optimality conditions

Theorem 4.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.2, let* $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ *be a Nash equilibrium point of Problem 2.1. Suppose that* $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot))$ *is the state process of the system* (2.1) *corresponding to the admissible control* $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$. *Let* $(\bar{p}^i(\cdot), \bar{q}^i(\cdot), \bar{k}^i(\cdot))(i = 1, 2)$ *be the unique solution of the adjoint equation* (3.1) *corresponding* $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot); \bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot))$. *Then we have*

$$\Big\langle H_{1u_1}(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{y}(t), \bar{z}(t), \bar{u}_1(t), \bar{u}_2(t), \bar{p}^1(t), \bar{q}^1(t), \bar{k}^1(t)), u_1 - \bar{u}_1(t) \Big\rangle \geq 0, \forall u_1 \in U_1 a.s.a.e., \tag{4.1}$$

$$\Big\langle H_{1u_2}(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{y}(t), \bar{z}(t), \bar{u}_1(t), \bar{u}_2(t), \bar{p}^1(t), \bar{q}^2(t), \bar{k}^2(t)), u_2 - \bar{u}_2(t) \Big\rangle \geq 0, \forall u_2 \in U_2, a.s.a.e.. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Since $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ be an equilibrium point, then

$$J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \min_{u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_1} J_1(u_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)). \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \min_{u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_2} J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)). \tag{4.4}$$

By (4.3), $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)$ can be regarded as an optimal control of the optimal control problem where the controlled system is (3.6) and the cost functional is (3.7). For this case, it is easy to see that the Hamilton function is H_1 (see (3.2)) and the correspond adjoint equation is (3.1) for $i = 1$, and $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot))$ is the corresponding optimal state process. Thus applying the stochastic maximum principle for the optimal control of the forward-backward stochastic system (see Theorem 3.3 in [32]), we can obtain (4.1). Similarly, from (4.4), we can obtain (4.2). The proof is complete.

5 Conclution

In this paper, we have discussed two-person non-zero sum differential game governed by a fully coupled forward-backward stochastic system with the control process $u(\cdot)$ appearing in the forward diffusion term. The verification theory is obtained as a sufficient condition for the existence of open-loop Nash equilibrium point. On the other hand, applying the stochastic maximum principle for the optimal control problem of the forward-backward stochastic system, we derive the the stochastic maximum principle in a local formulation as a necessary condition for the existence of open-loop Nash equilibrium point.

□

References

[1] F. Antonelli. Backward-forward stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3:777–793, 1993.

[2] T. basar and S. Li. In *Proceedings of IFAC 10th Word Congress*, pages 231–236.

[3] L. D. Berkovitz. A differential games without pure strategies solutions on an open set, advances in game theory. In *Annuals of Mathematica Studies*, number 52, pages 174–194. Princeton University Press, Providence, New Jersey, 1964.

[4] L. D. Berkovitz. A variational approach to differential games, advances in game theory. In *Annuals of Mathematica Studies*, number 52, pages 127–174. Princeton University Press, Providence, New Jersey, 1964.

[5] L. D. Berkovitz. Necessary conditions for optimal strategies in a class of differential games and control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 5:1–24, 1967.

[6] L. D. Berkovitz. *A Survey of Differential Games.* Mathematical Theory of Control. Academic Press, 1967.

[7] L. D. Berkovitz. The existence of value and saddle point in games of fixed duration. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 23:173–196, 1985.

[8] J. H. Case. Toward a theory of many-player differential games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 7:179–197, 1969.

[9] G. Chen and Q. Zheng. N-person differential games, part 1-3. *Mathematial Research reports, Pennsylvania State University*, 1984.

[10] D. Duffie and L. Epstein. Asset pricing with stochastic differential utilities. *Rev. Financial Stud.*, 5:411–436, 1992.

[11] T. Eisele. Nonexistence and nonuniqueness of open-loop equilibrium in linear-quadratic differential games. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 37:443–468, 1982.

[12] N. El Karoui, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez. Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Math. Finance*, 7:1–71, 1997.

[13] R. J. Elliott and N. J. Kalton. The existence of value in differential games. *Memories of the Amercian mathematical Society*, 126:1–67, 1972.

[14] W. H. Flemming. the convergence prblem for differential games. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 3:102–116, 1961.

[15] W. H. Flemming. The convergence problem for differential games, part 2, advances in games theory. In *Annuals of Mathematica Studies*, number 52, pages 195–210. Princeton University Press, Providence, New Jersey, 1964.

[16] A. Friedman. Linear-quadratic differential games with nonzero sum and n-players. *Journal of Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 34:165–178, 1969.

[17] A. Friedman. Stochastic differential games. *J. Differential Equations*, 11:79–108, 1972.

[18] R. Isaacs. Differential games, parts 1-4. *The RAND Corporation, Research Memorandums*, pages Nos. RM–1391, RM–1399, RM–1411, RM–1486,, 1954-55.

[19] D. L. Lukes and D. L. Russell. A global theory for linear-quadratic differential games. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 33:96–123, 1971.

[20] J. Ma and J. Yong. On linear, degenerate backward stochastic partial differential equations. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 113:135–170, 1999.

[21] S. Peng and Z. Wu. Fully coupled forward-backward stochastic differential equations and applications to optimal control. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37:825–843, 1999.

[22] I. G. Sarma and U. R. Prasad. A note on the necessary conditions for optimal strategies in a class of noncoperative n-person differential games. *SIAM J. Control. Optim.*, 9:441–445, 1971.

[23] I. G. Sarma, R. K. Ragade, and U. R. Prasad. Necessary conditions for optimal strategies in a class of noncoperative n-person differential games. *SIAM J. Control. Optim.*, 7:637–644, 1969.

[24] J. Shi and Z. Wu. The maximum principle for fully coupled forward backward stochastic control system. *Acta Automat Sinica*, 32:375–380, 2006.

[25] A. W. Starr. Nonzero-sum differential games: Concepts and models,. *Harvard University, Engineering and Applied Physics, Technical Report*, (590), 1969.

[26] A. W. Starr and Y. C. Ho. Further properties of nonzero-sum differential games. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 3:207–219, 1969.

[27] A. W. Starr and Y. C. Ho. Nonzero-sum differential games. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Application*, 3:184–206, 1969.

[28] S. Tang and X. Li. Differential games of n players in stochastic systems with controlled diffusion terms. *Automation and Remote Control*, 69:874–890, 2008.

[29] K. Uchida. On existence of a nash equilibrium point in n-person nonzero sum stochastic differential games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 16, 1978.

[30] P. Varaiya. N-person nonzero-sum differential games with linear dynamics. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 8:441–449, 1970.

[31] G. Wang and Z. Yu. A pontryagin's maximum principle for non-zero sum differential games of bsdes with applications. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55:1742–1747, 2010.

[32] Z. Wu. Maximum principle for optimal control problem of fully coupled forward-backward stochastic systems. *Acta Math. Appl. Sinica (English Ser.)*, 11:249–259, 1998.

[33] W. Xu. Stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problem of forward and backward system. *J. Aust. Math.*, 37:172–185, 1995.

[34] J. Yong. Optimality variational principle for controlled forward-backward stochastic differential equations with mixed initial-terminal conditions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 48:4119–4156, 2010.